



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

kindness; and light of heart, and hoping to gain any quantity of laurels in the south, I marched forward with the regiment, as a part of the command, destined to recover the Carolinas and Georgia. The bloody battle of Camden, fought on the 16th of August, bad luck to the day, brought me once again into trouble. Our regiment was cut up root and branch, and poor Pilgarlic, my unfortunate self, wounded and made prisoner. My prejudices against a jail I have frankly told, and being pretty confident that I should not a whit better relish a lodging in the inside of a prison-ship, I once again suffered myself to be persuaded, and listed in the infantry of Tarleton's Legion. O, botheration, what a mistake. I never before had kept such bad company; as a man of honour, I was out of my *element*, and should certainly have given them leg bail, but that I had no time to brood over my misfortunes, for the battle of the Cowpens quickly following, Howard and Old Kirkwood gave us the bayonet so handsomely, that we were taken one and all, and I should have escaped unhurt, had not a dragoon of Washington's added a scratch or two to the account already scored on my unfortunate carcass. As to all the miseries that I have since endured, afflicted with a scarcity of every thing but appetite and mosquitoes, I say nothing about them. My love for my country gives me courage to support that, and a great deal more when it comes. I love my comrades, and they love Docherty. Exchanging kindnesses, we give care to the dogs; but surely you will not be surprised, after all that I have said, that I feel *some qualms* at the thought of battle, since, take *whatever* side I will, I am always sure to find it the *the wrong one*.' "

This work is disfigured by typographical errors, too numerous and glaring to be passed over unnoticed. It does not, in this respect, appear to have received common attention from the printers.



ART. XXIII.—'Η καὶνὴ Διαθήκη. *Novum Testamentum Græce, ex recensione Jo. Jac. Griesbachii, cum selecta lectionum varietate. Lipsiæ, G. J. Göschen, 1805. Cantabrigiæ, Novanglorum, 1809. Wells & Hilliard. 8vo.*

FROM the apostolic age to the beginning of the sixteenth century, a period of more than fourteen hundred years, the writings of the New Testament existed in manuscript. They must consequently have been exposed, like all other writings, to the various errors arising from transcription. And, as the multiplication of copies was far greater than of any other writing, these errors, to say nothing of the alterations which were

designedly made to favor the purposes of a party, must have been proportionally more numerous. When the autographs of the sacred writers became lost, as it is impossible for human accuracy to produce a transcript, which shall be a perfect *fac-simile* of its original, the genuine text of the New Testament was no longer to be found in any single manuscript, but was scattered among them all. Like that of any ancient author, it can now be determined only by a comparison of manuscripts, and, out of the number of the various readings, which they present, by the selection of that, in every instance, which is recommended by the highest authority. The authority of the readings must depend principally upon the value of the manuscripts in which they are found ; and the value of the manuscripts, upon the nearness of their connexion with the originals, and the degree of accuracy with which they were written.

But there are two other sources, besides the testimony of Greek manuscripts, which are of the highest importance in estimating the authority of a reading. These are the very ancient and literal versions of the New Testament into the languages of the East ; and the exceedingly numerous quotations, which are found in the writings of the early Greek fathers. These both furnish evidence of the readings of the manuscripts from which they were made ; and which were of an antiquity, greater, by several centuries, than the oldest which have come down to us.

Manuscript authority then, confirmed by the testimony of versions and fathers, is the only authority, which can be lawfully regarded by an editor of the Greek Testament. The press can give no sanction to a text which is destitute of this support.

The *Received Text*, which has for the last two hundred years, been scrupulously printed, word for word, in all editions of the Greek Testament, with a very few exceptions, and which the christian world has all this time not only acquiesced in, but regarded with a superstitious veneration, as containing the very *words* and *letters* of inspiration, which it would be nothing short of impiety for man to attempt to alter, can, *of itself*, have no authority ; but must depend for this, as we have seen, entirely upon the sources, from which it was derived.

The *Received Text* is that, which proceeded from the celebrated press of the Elzevirs, at Leyden, in the year 1624. It was derived, with but few alterations, and these of but lit-

the importance, through Beza and Stephens, from the fifth edition of Erasmus, somewhat altered by the Complutensian. Its value will depend upon the *authorities*, which these several editors possessed for settling the true reading, and the *use* which they made of them. We shall commence with its formation by Erasmus, and trace its descent thence, through the hands of the subsequent editors.

Erasmus, while engaged in the superintendence of the publication of the works of Jerom, at Bâle, in Switzerland, received an application from Froben, the printer, to prepare an edition of the New Testament in Greek; which it was desired should be finished as soon as possible, as the profits of the sale would depend, in a great measure, upon its being delivered to the public before the Complutensian Polyglot, which was already printed, and awaiting only a license from Pope Leo X. This application was made on the 17th of April, 1515, and repeated on the 30th of the same month. The subscription to the work is dated February 1516. Supposing then Erasmus to have commenced immediately upon the second application, not more than nine months could have been employed in the preparation and printing. But it appears from the account of Erasmus himself, in a letter from Antwerp, dated June, 1516, that the work was accomplished even in less time than this; for he says, 'I have at length escaped from my confinement at Bâle, where I have performed the work of six years in *eight months*.' Now, in this short period, he was obliged to prepare, besides the Greek text, a Latin version, to be printed in a parallel column, and a large collection of notes. And all this too, at a time when he was engaged in the publication of the works of Jerom, which he says, 'demanded a great part of his attention.' It appears besides, from his letters, which Wetstein has produced in his Prolegomena, that he was himself dissatisfied with his first edition; that he was sensible he had prepared it with too much haste, considering the novelty and importance of the undertaking; having been required to supply the press with a new sheet every day. '*Præcipitatum fuit*,' are his words, '*verius quam editum*.'

However great then were the learning and critical abilities of Erasmus, it could not be otherwise than that his first edition, from the great haste with which it was prepared, should abound with errors. Not to mention the remarkable omis-

sions and typographical mistakes—as παραβῆτε for πειραβῆτε, γῆς for ζωῆς, &c. which are every where apparent, it has hence happened, that the Latin version frequently differs from the Greek, and the quotations from the text, in the annotations, from both; of which last kind of errors, *eighteen* examples were pointed out to him by Lee, his English opponent.\*

The errors, however, occasioned by haste in the preparation, printing, and correction of the press, are of but little importance, in estimating the authority of the first edition of Erasmus, compared with other means we possess; which are the materials he used in forming his text. These materials consisted of *four* Greek manuscripts, and a manuscript of Theophylact, containing the Greek text, with his commentary on the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles. Three of these manuscripts were particularly examined, and carefully collated, by Wetstein, during his residence at Bâle, where they are still preserved in the public library. Consequently his account of them, if any one's, is worthy of our regard.

They did not contain, each, the whole New Testament, nor even the greater part of it. One contained only the Gospels; another, only the Acts and Epistles; a third, only the Apocalypse; and these three, constituting together one copy of the New Testament, were corrected by Erasmus from his other documents, and from conjecture; and afterwards used by the printer in setting the types, as is evident from the marks which are still to be seen in the margin.

The first manuscript, containing the gospels, was written, according to Wetstein, as late as the fifteenth century, is incorrect, and of very little value. The letters and diphthongs, η, ι, and ει, ω and ο, αι and ε, β and ν, are frequently confounded; and there are many omissions on account of ὁμοιοτέλευτα. Numerous hasty and erroneous alterations, made by Erasmus from the vulgate, and his other documents, and even from conjecture, are mentioned by Wetstein as being still visible in the margin of this manuscript.†

The second of the above manuscripts, containing the Acts and Epistles, is likewise a very modern one; though more ancient, and more accurate, than the former. Mill, from a specimen which he procured of its Greek character, judged it to have been written in the twelfth or thirteenth century. Erasmus appears to have followed it much more closely than

\* Wetstein's Prolegomena, p. 123.

† Prolegomena, p. 44.

the preceding. Indeed, in the Acts, it was so scrupulously adhered to, that, according to the computation of Mill,\* the editor corrected its text, in only about forty places; of which number of corrections, not less than one quarter part were made at the expense of the genuine reading. In the Epistles, Erasmus departed from this manuscript in about one hundred and eighty places; in thirty-two of which he altered the reading of its text upon insufficient authority.

The third manuscript, containing the Apocalypse, is no longer to be found. But Erasmus has very highly extolled it, on account of its antiquity, describing it, as '*tantæ vetustatis, ut apostolorum ætate scriptum videri possit*;' notwithstanding to the Greek text was subjoined the exposition of Arethas, who, according to Fabricius, was archbishop of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, as late as the year 914. There is, however, a great uncertainty with regard to the time, when this Arethas lived. Wetstein, upon the authority of Mill, refers him to the eleventh century. Cave, though he has placed his name as far back as the middle of the sixth century, finally concludes it to be a subject of mere conjecture. If this cannot be determined, we have no means, as the manuscript is now lost, of ascertaining its age and value. However, this is of but little importance; as Erasmus has not very scrupulously adhered to its readings, though it was the only Greek document he possessed for the Apocalypse; but has frequently adopted those, which seem to have had no better authority than his own conjecture.

The above three manuscripts, constituting together one complete copy of the New Testament, were, we have observed, corrected by his other documents, viz: his remaining Greek manuscript, and his manuscript of Theophylact.

The former, containing the whole New Testament, except the Apocalypse, was, according to Wetstein, who examined it at Bâle, written in the tenth century. But though it was the most ancient and valuable manuscript Erasmus possessed, but little use was made of it in preparing his edition; and this, by the correcters of the press, in some cases, without his knowledge, and contrary to his direction; because he suspected it to contain readings, which had been derived from the vulgate.† Erasmus must therefore have principally depended, for the correction of his manuscripts, upon the text

\* Prolegomena, p. 112, § 1120.

† Wetst. Proleg. pp. 43, 44.

and commentary of Theophylact. But the quotations of Theophylact, who was the last of the Greek fathers, are of no more authority in deciding the genuineness of a reading, than a manuscript written at the end of the eleventh century.

Besides these authorities, if deserving the name, Erasmus professes to have derived occasional assistance from the works of Origen, Chrysostom, and Cyril. But, considering the haste with which his first edition was prepared ; that the writings of these fathers had not, at that time, been printed in Greek, but only in Latin translations, which abounded with errors and corrupted readings, the intended amendments of recent editors ; that Erasmus had no means of detecting these errors and corruptions ; and that he was furnished with no facilities for reference to the works of Origen and Cyril, throughout which the quotations from the New Testament are scattered promiscuously, we can hardly believe it possible that the writings of these fathers could have rendered him any essential service in the formation of his text.

But there were two sources of correction, merely alluded to above, of which Erasmus, more probably through necessity than choice, appears to have made considerable use, throughout the New Testament. These were his conjecture and the modern vulgate. But the former must have wanted authority in proportion as he wanted means of judging ; and the latter had, at that time, become so corrupted, by mistakes of transcribers, and by innumerable interpolations from the old Latin versions before the time of Jerom, as to call soon after for repeated revision under papal authority. And it is the more surprising that it should have been recurred to by Erasmus, as he had objected to the use of his most ancient and valuable manuscript, merely on the ground of a suspicion, that its readings had been derived from this source. It is more probable, however, that he was driven to this alternative by the want of authorities, than that he acted from any bias of his own in favor of the vulgate, or any deference to the high regard in which it had for ages been held. In one place, indeed, at the end of the Apocalypse, he has made this acknowledgment ; where, the only Greek document he possessed, being defective, he has taken the liberty of supplying the want by Greek of his own making, from the Latin version. He acknowledges, however, but one verse, the 19th, to have been made in this manner ; though it is evident that the whole of the *six* last

verses had no better origin ; for the Greek, in this short passage, differs from manuscripts no less than thirty times.\* Besides three other places in the Apocalypse, mentioned by Wetstein, where Erasmus has given Greek of his own making, and where perhaps his manuscript was defective, the same liberty seems to have been taken in other parts of the New Testament, where nothing of the kind could be urged in his justification ; as, for instance, Acts ix. 5 and 6, a long passage, which has not been found in a single Greek manuscript.†

In the account which has thus been given of the manner in which the first edition of Erasmus was formed, it was necessary to be the more particular, as it was taken as the *basis* of all his following editions.

The text of the second, published in 1519, was much more pure and correct than that of the former. He restored the genuine reading, according to Mill's computation, in about three hundred and thirty places ; but departed from it, where it was contained in the preceding edition, in not less than seventy.‡

The third edition, 1522, so closely follows the second, as to differ from it in only about one hundred and eighteen places ; in nearly one third of which it follows the Aldine edition of 1518,|| which is of the least authority, in a critical point of view ; being little else than a reimpression of the first of Erasmus, retaining even the errors of the press. In this third edition, the editor seems to have made some alterations, out of regard to popular prejudice, even against his own conviction ; of which the insertion of 1 John, v. 7, may be mentioned as an instance.

In preparing his second and third editions, Erasmus had access to some other authorities than those which he used for his first. It is doubtful, however, whether they were any thing more than extracts, which were sent him by his friends, from Greek manuscripts, the number, character, and value of which are unknown ; and the works of one or two other of the fathers, to which the same remarks may be extended, that were made respecting those used for the first edition, and to which he seems but seldom to have had recourse. The consequence then is, as might have been expected, though in a

\* Wetst. Proleg. p. 126.

† See Marsh's Michaelis, vol. ii. P. 1. pp. 496—498. ed. 2d.

‡ Prolegomena, § 1134.

|| Ibid. § 1138.



somewhat greater degree it must be confessed, that numerous errors, and corrupted readings, which existed in the first edition, were retained in the two following; and this is true, in a great number of instances, even with regard to the errors of the press.

The fourth edition, 1527, is somewhere said by Erasmus to agree, in almost every respect, with the Complutensian New Testament, which had been delivered to the public five years before. But so far is this assertion from being true, that it contains, according to Mill,\* but one hundred and six readings, derived from the Complutensian edition; of which no less than ninety are in the Apocalypse alone; and, in all the other books of the New Testament, it agrees with the third edition, except in the sixteen readings from the Complutensian, four from manuscript authority, and three from the correctors of the press. The influence then of the Complutensian edition upon the fourth of Erasmus was but small, except in the Apocalypse; consequently it will be sufficient to make a few general remarks respecting its character.

It was printed at Alcala, the ancient Complutum, in Spain, under the patronage of Cardinal Ximenes, by whose liberality some of the most distinguished Greek scholars of the age were employed to prepare the text of the New Testament; and furnished with manuscripts which had been procured at a great expense. Of these the editors have given no particular account; but have highly extolled them, on account of their antiquity and accuracy; and it has been generally supposed, that the celebrated Codex Vaticanus, one of the most ancient and valuable manuscripts which are known, was of the number. Excepting, for the present, the Vaticanus; none of the manuscripts of the New Testament, used by the Complutensian editors, are now known; they probably have been destroyed. The question then respecting their antiquity and value, can be determined only by the character of the readings of the Complutensian text. With regard to these, it seems now to be clearly ascertained, that they almost invariably agree with those readings of the modern manuscripts—manuscripts of the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries—in which these are united, in opposition to the readings of the ancient manuscripts and the quotations of the early Greek fathers. It must therefore be inferred, that the text of the Complutensian New Testa-

\* Proleg. §1141.

ment was formed from manuscripts the most modern, and of the least authority. Respecting the Codex Vaticanus, Bishop Marsh says, that he has carefully collated the Complutensian edition, with those complete extracts, which were published by Birch from this manuscript, but has not found, in the former, a single reading, which is *peculiar* to the latter. These *peculiar* readings are exceedingly numerous. In the three first chapters of Matthew, for instance, they amount to no less than twenty-five; and even in one chapter in John, the last, Birch has quoted as many as twenty eight, not one of which is to be discovered in the Complutensian edition.\* Now, whether this manuscript were, or were not, of the number of those, which were used by the Complutensian editors; the only question of any importance seems to be decided, viz. that it had no influence upon the text of their edition.

The number of readings, which were taken from the Complutensian edition, and thence transmitted, through the fourth of Erasmus, into the Received Text, is as we have said, small, except in the Apocalypse; where seventy-four, out of the ninety readings derived from this source, are esteemed by Mill to be genuine. Here Erasmus acted judiciously, in preferring a better authority to his single mutilated manuscript of this book. But it is, at the same time, somewhat remarkable that he did not avail himself of the same authority to correct the errors, which he had committed in giving his own translation from the Vulgate, where his manuscript was defective; whence it has happened, that many of them have been suffered to be retained, and to appear, at this day, in the text, through the negligence of subsequent editors; of those even, who have most highly extolled the value of Greek manuscripts, and condemned the Latin version.

The fifth edition, printed in 1535, and the last, which was published by Erasmus, differs, according to Mill,† in only *four* places from the preceding.

The next editor, by whom the text of the fifth edition of Erasmus was transmitted in the direct line to the Elzevirs, is Robert Stephens. It will be unnecessary to notice either of his two first editions, because they appear to have had no influence upon the following, the celebrated folio edition of 1550. Stephens has boasted much of his diligence and fidelity in collating his Greek manuscripts a second and even a third time,

\* Marsh's *Michaelis*, vol II. P. 2, pp. 818—820.

† Proleg. § 1150.

to prepare the text for this edition, so as to suffer not even a letter to be printed otherwise than the greater and better part of them approved. 'But,' says Griesbach, 'all this is most vain and false. Every one can see with his own eyes, that Stephens had almost no regard to his manuscripts, that he examined neither the age, value, agreement, nor even number of his authorities; but adopted, in almost every instance, by a blind impulse, as it were, whatever Erasmus presented. Nay, he has often followed in the steps of Erasmus, *against the authority of all his manuscripts*.\* His pretensions are contradicted even by his own margin, where, in more than one hundred places, he has quoted *all* his authorities for readings different from that which he has given in his text. So closely indeed does this third edition of Stephens follow the fifth of Erasmus, that it can be regarded as but little more than a *reimpression*; except in the Apocalypse, where it follows the Complutensian text; though the preference of the editor seems to have been arbitrary. According to Wetstein, who speaks upon the authority of Mill, these two editions of Stephens and Erasmus differ scarcely *twenty* times, throughout the whole of the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles. 'Nor,' continues Griesbach, 'have I read any thing, whether produced by Stephens or his admirers, which can excuse his servile submission to Erasmus, in preference to the authority of his manuscripts; among which he says were some almost entitled to adoration from their appearance of antiquity.'

But though the manuscripts of Stephens were not consulted for the correction of his text, they were made to contribute a large collection of various readings, to be exhibited in his margin. Of these some notice should be taken, as they have had an influence, though small indeed, upon following editions.

The manuscripts from which they were taken, amounting, with the Complutensian edition, to sixteen, were not particularly described by Stephens. Some of them appear to have been valuable, particularly the Codex Cantabrigiensis, or Bezae, one of the most ancient; and the manuscript denoted by the letter L in Griesbach's New Testament, which he refers to the eighth or ninth century, and considers of the highest importance, as remarkably coinciding with the readings of Origen, the representative of the Alexandrine Recension. They were not however collated by Robert Stephens, but by his son

\* Griesbachii Proleg. ed. 2d. p. xviii.

Henry, who, on account of his youth (he was at this time but eighteen years of age) and inexperience in criticism, must have been inadequate to the undertaking. This appears too from the imperfect manner, in which the collation was made, and the result exhibited in the margin of Robert. For, in noting the various readings of the Complutensian edition, which amounted to *thirteen hundred*, more than *seven hundred* were entirely omitted; and of those, which were quoted, no less than one *twelfth* part were quoted falsely. The same negligence appears with regard to his other documents, as far as they have been re-collated. It is not even mentioned what books of the New Testament each manuscript contains. Numerous *errata* were committed in the letters, by which the manuscripts were denoted; whence different manuscripts were frequently confounded, and quoted for readings in books, which they did not contain.

Such being the truth, and, considering the great pretensions, which the editor made to accuracy, and the attention he bestowed upon the splendor of his edition, we cannot but perceive the propriety of the words of Mill, who says of the collection of various readings exhibited in Stephens' margin, '*in pompam, magis quam in usum, congesta videtur.*'\*

We now come to Beza's edition of 1582; for the preparation of which he was furnished with more and better authorities, than had fallen to the lot of any former editor. For, besides the editions then existing, he possessed the autograph of Henry Stephens, containing a larger collection of various readings than the margin of Robert's edition. He had also in his possession those two very ancient manuscripts, the Cambridge and Clermont; besides the Syriac Version, and an Arabic Version of the Acts, and two Epistles to the Corinthians. But these valuable materials seem to have been lost in the hands of Beza. For, deficient in critical ability, and blinded by theological prejudice, he was influenced less, in determining the genuineness of readings by *manuscript authority*, than by the *analogy of faith*. His text is the same as that of the third edition of Robert Stephens, fifty places only being excepted; many of which emendations are taken from the margin of Stephens, and founded upon the insufficient authority of a single manuscript. The principal use, which he made of his critical materials, was to explain his sense of Scripture, and serve the purposes of polemic divinity. With this view, he

\* Proleg. §1157.

has approved, in his notes, of one hundred and fifty readings, differing from those in the text; and esteemed as of equal authority, four times the number. For it appears that his judgment respecting them was often but mere conjecture; or was founded upon the uncertain evidence of a corrupted copy of the Syriac, or of the Latin version alone, or upon some one manuscript, or the Complutensian edition; in opposition to the concurrent testimony of the most ancient manuscripts, fathers, and versions.

Wetstein, who is somewhat severe in his remarks upon Beza, has charged him with not only suppressing the largest number, and the most important of the readings of his *Codices Cantabrigiensis* and *Claromontanus*, but with denying that they came to his knowledge; with strenuously maintaining, in places where Robert Stephens, through negligence, has quoted no various reading, that all his seventeen manuscripts (making, by the way, one more than Stephens possessed,) agreed in the reading of the text; and lastly, with quoting, as two distinct and independent authorities, his *Codex Cantabrigiensis*, and the *Codex Stephani* β, as by turns confirming each other; though it is difficult to suppose Beza to have been ignorant of the fact, that these are but two names for one and the same manuscript.\* From this, which appears to be a just representation of the unfairness, or of the carelessness of Beza, we may estimate the degree of authority, which is due to his fifty emendations of the text of Stephens, and his one hundred and fifty approved readings.

From the texts of Stephens and Beza was compiled that of the celebrated edition, which was printed by the Elzevirs, in 1624. Who was the editor, Wetstein endeavored in vain to ascertain. He appears to have made no use of manuscripts, nor of any other critical authority. He followed principally the third edition of Robert Stephens. His emendations, which amount, according to Griesbach's particular enumeration, to about one hundred, were taken, with very few exceptions, from Beza. Upon what authority these exceptions depend is unknown. But his text, recommended by nothing in particular, but the common opinion of the correctness of the Elzevir editions, and by the neatness and elegance of its typographical execution, has been adopted as the standard of subsequent editions, and thence been denominated the *Received Text*.

From the account we have now given of the manner, in

\* Vide Prolegomena, p. 148.

which the *Received Text* of the New Testament has been formed, it appears, that no document, though possessed, has been used by either of the editors as the means of correction, which has any claims to a higher antiquity than the tenth century. Manuscript criticism, which was in its infancy at the time when the editions of Erasmus issued from the press, was by no means advanced by the subsequent labors of Robert Stephens, Beza, or the editors of the Elzevir text. It is to the assiduous researches and valuable discoveries of the learned, for the last hundred and fifty years, that we are indebted for the possession of a *critical apparatus*, and the rules of its application, which furnish the only means for the restoration of the text of the New Testament to its primitive purity. To whose labors we are indebted for these discoveries, what are the materials which compose this apparatus, and the rules by which the sacred critic must be governed in its application, we will now proceed as distinctly as possible to explain.

The first, who deserves our particular notice, is Brian Walton; to whose exertions, aided by several of his distinguished literary friends, we are indebted for the London Polyglot, published in 1653—1657, in six volumes, folio. The editor says, in his preface, that he had examined the most celebrated editions, ancient and recent; had carefully inspected the ancient versions; made diligent search through the public libraries for the best manuscripts, collated them, and compared his results with the labors of those who had gone before him; so as to notice what was excellent in each, what was deficient in all; whereby he was enabled to supply the defects of preceding editions, and make some valuable accessions to the stock of critical materials. The Greek text of the New Testament, which is contained in the fifth volume, is the same with that of Stephens' folio edition; which the editor preferred to adopt, as it was the only one, to which the various readings of Stephens' margin could be applied. Besides the Greek text, and the vulgate, the same volume contains the Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions, and, in the gospels, the Persic; each of which is accompanied with a literal translation in Latin, for the benefit of those, who are unacquainted with the oriental languages. Under the Greek text are placed several readings from that manuscript of venerable antiquity, which is known by the name of the Codex Alexandrinus. The sixth volume contained by far the most copious collection of various read-

ings, that had appeared ; comprising those from Stephens' margin, the readings of sixteen Velesian manuscripts, so called from Peter Faxard, marquis of Velez, who is said to have collated them, and of sixteen other manuscripts, collated under the direction of archbishop Usher ; which, it is true, with the exception of two or three, are very modern, and of little authority. The Velesian readings were esteemed by Wetstein of no value, and unworthy of quotation ; as he supposed Velez to have used only Latin manuscripts, and to have translated their readings into Greek. Griesbach says of them, '*Lectiones Velesianæ, ex editione Stephani Latina anni 1540 collata cum ejusdem editione Græca anni 1550 collectæ, et Græcis vocabulis expressæ.*'\* Marsh is also of the same opinion. The London Polyglot then is valuable to the critic, principally on account of the oriental versions, which it contains ; as all the manuscripts of any importance, that are here quoted, have been since more accurately collated. Some of them, however, not having been further examined, Mill and Wetstein have taken their readings from the Polyglot.

The edition of the Greek Testament which was published by Dr Fell, bishop of Oxford, in 1675, in one volume octavo, though it far surpassed the London Polyglot, in its collection of various readings, it will be unnecessary particularly to notice, as the bishop delivered all his papers to Mill, who thoroughly revised them, and greatly augmented their critical materials.

'Here,' says Michaelis, 'ends the infancy of criticism, in respect to the New Testament ; and the age of manhood commences with the celebrated edition of John Mill, which he finished only fourteen days before his death, after having bestowed on it the labor of thirty years.†

It was published at Oxford, in 1707, in one volume, folio. In his preliminary dissertation, the editor says, that he entertains no small hope, that by the assistance of the various readings, which he has from all quarters accumulated, the attentive reader will be able to discover, in almost every place, what was the genuine reading of the sacred text. He says, that he had labored almost incessantly, for nearly thirty years, in laying open, and examining the treasures of the ancient fathers and ecclesiastical writers, of the oriental and other most ancient versions, and of the best manuscripts ; (not to mention the

\* Prolegomena, p. 112.

† Marsh's Michaelis, vol. ii. P. 1. p. 454, 455.

editions) as well as others of every age and character, that the reader might immediately perceive what had been the condition of the Greek text of the New Testament, in the manuscripts of every age, from the time of the first formation of the canon.

The text is that of Stephens' third edition, accompanied with the readings of his sixteen manuscripts. To these, Mill has added the readings of the London Polyglot, including the *Velesian*; those which were printed in *Fell's* edition, with others which the bishop afterwards added in manuscript; among which should be mentioned the readings of twenty-two Greek manuscripts, including the *Codex Vaticanus*, which were collated by *Caryophilus*, at Rome, under order of pope *Urban VIII.* for the purpose of preparing a new edition of the Greek Testament, which, however, never was printed; and, lastly, the extracts from numerous manuscripts, which had, till then, been either wholly neglected, or only partially collated. Preceding editors had contented themselves with giving the mere extracts, without any particular description of the character and value of their authorities. But Mill has abundantly supplied their deficiencies in this respect, in the full and distinct account he has given in his *Prolegomena*, of the sources from which he has drawn; and has thereby enabled every reader to judge for himself of the comparative weight of evidence, by which different readings are supported. Of the value of the writings of the fathers, as a means of estimating the authority of various readings, Mill was the first who seems to have been sensible. He widely differed in opinion upon this subject, from his great patron and predecessor, *Fell*; who endeavored to dissuade him from devoting his time to the study of the fathers, under the conviction that no dependence could be placed upon the accuracy of their quotations. That Mill has sometimes erred in over estimating their value, and has enumerated amongst his various readings, citations which were made from memory, will not, we presume, be denied. Indeed, in a work of so great extent and nicety, numerous errors must have been unavoidable; and the rather, as he did not travel for the purpose of examining the documents himself, but was obliged to depend upon the accuracy of the collation of others.

The two principal defects in Mill's edition arise—the one, from his having suffered himself to be influenced, in his selec-



tion of readings, by an undue bias in favor of the Vulgate ; and the other, from his ignorance of the oriental languages ; whence he was under the necessity, in quoting the readings of the Syriac, Arabic, and Ethiopic versions, of depending upon the Latin translations, which are annexed to them in the London Polyglot. From this latter cause alone, Michaelis says, have arisen *thousands* of mistakes ; to be convinced of which, one needs only to have recourse to his ‘*Curæ in Actus Apostolorum Syriacos* ;’ where he has shown them to amount to at least *five hundred*, in the Acts of the Apostles alone.\* These errors of Mill were corrected in a work published by professor Bode, in 1767, entitled, ‘*Pseudo-critica Millio Bengeliana*.’ Mill appears likewise to have erred in many instances by giving a positive decision respecting readings, when there was ground only for conjecture.

The labors of Mill to furnish the materials for restoring the original purity of the sacred text, and the publication of such a vast collection of various readings, amounting to *thirty thousand*, were regarded with concern by the friends of christianity, as being of a tendency injurious to the religion, and threatening to undermine the foundation of their faith. The ‘*free thinkers*’ of the day were alert to take advantage of this alarm ; and Whitby’s weak attempt to support the position, that the reading of the Received Text may in all places be defended,† was applied by Collins as proof of the uncertainty and precariousness of the very text of the word of God. But the prevailing false notions of the time, which ascribed absolute perfection and verbal integrity, to the Received Text—as though the hand of every transcriber, for the space of fourteen centuries, had been guided by inspiration, and Erasmus had printed from manuscripts, which corresponded in every minute particular to the original writings—were corrected, and the attacks of infidelity upon divine revelation repelled, in an able and acute reply to Collins by Dr Bentley, under the assumed name of ‘*Philelutherus Lipsiensis*.’

In this work, the author shows it to be ‘a fact undeniable,

\* Marsh’s Michaelis, vol. ii. P. 1. p. 459.

† *Lectiones variantes, quæ sunt momenti alicujus, aut sensum textus mutant, paucissimas esse atque in iis omnibus lectionem textus defendi posse.*

Examen Variantium Lectionum Johannis Millii. ‘Doleo,’ he says on the first page of his preface, ‘et moleste fero tam multa me in Millii Prologomenis invenisse, quæ fidei nostræ normam vel plane labefactare videantur, vel saltem aliis ansam nimis speciosam præbeant de ea dubitandi.’

that the sacred books have suffered *no more alteration than common and classic authors* ; that it has been the common sense of men of letters, that numbers of manuscripts do not make a text *precarious*, but are useful, nay, necessary to its establishment and certainty.\*

‘*Terence*,’ he says, ‘is now in one of the best conditions of any of the classic writers. The oldest and best copy of him is now in the Vatican library, which comes nearest to the poet’s own hand ; but even that has hundreds of errors, most of which may be mended out of other exemplars, that are otherwise more recent, and of inferior value. I myself have collated several ; and do affirm, that I have seen twenty thousand various lections in that little author, not near so big as the whole *New Testament* ; and am morally sure, that if half the number of manuscripts were collated for *Terence* with that niceness and minuteness, which have been used in twice as many for the *New Testament*, the number of the *variations* would amount to above fifty thousand.’†

‘Not frightened, therefore, with the present thirty thousand, (various readings of Dr Mill,) I, for my part, and, as I believe, many others, would not lament, if, out of the old manuscripts yet untouched, ten thousand more were faithfully collected ; some of which, without question, would render the text more beautiful, just, and exact ; though of no consequence to the main of religion ; nay, perhaps wholly synonymous, in the view of common readers, and quite insensible to any modern version.’‡

‘*Terence* has as many variations as any book whatever, in proportion to its bulk ; and yet, with all its interpolations, omissions, additions, or glosses, (choose the worst of them on purpose,) you cannot deface the contrivance and plot of one play ; no, not of one single scene ; but its sense, design, and subserviency to the last issue and conclusion shall be visible and plain through all the mist of *various lections*. And so it is with the sacred text ; make your thirty thousand as many more, if numbers of copies can ever reach that sum ; all the better to a knowing and serious reader, who is thereby more richly furnished to select what he sees genuine. But even put them into the hands of a knave or a fool ; and yet, with the most sinistrous and absurd choice, he shall not extinguish the light of any one chapter, nor so disguise christianity, but that every feature of it will still be the same.’||

\* Remarks upon a late discourse of Free-thinking, edit. 4th. London, 1714. p. 74.

† Ibid. p. 66.

‡ Ibid. p. 72.

|| Ibid. p. 76

Mill's New Testament was published after his death by Küster, at Amsterdam, in 1710, who corrected none of the errors of the former edition, but added to the collection the readings of twelve new manuscripts. In his preface, Küster has given an account of the sources and character of all the various readings, to show that the difference of the manuscripts of the New Testament is of much less importance, than the friends of religion had apprehended, or its enemies boasted.\*

Mill's edition of the New Testament, though the authorities he consulted have been since more accurately examined, his deficiencies supplied, and errors corrected, still retains much of its original value ; as the readings of a large number of his manuscripts have been entirely omitted by subsequent editors ; and as he has given, in his valuable Prolegomena, a more full account of many things connected with the criticism of Greek text, than has ever appeared.

Passing over the edition, published at Tübingen, in 1734, by Bengel, who contributed not a little to advance the knowledge of sacred criticism, by adding to the materials already existing, by giving a *selection* of various readings ; expressing his opinion by Greek letters in the margin, respecting their comparative claims to genuineness ; and above all, by his '*Introductio in Crisin Novi Testamenti*,' and '*Apparatus Criticus*,' which was subjoined to his Greek Testament, and republished, after his death, with the numerous alterations and additions, which he had left in manuscript ; we come to the edition, by which all preceding ones were surpassed, of the celebrated Wetstein, printed in 1751 and 1752, in two volumes folio, at Amsterdam.

From Bâle, the place of his nativity, where he had early evinced a remarkable fondness for critical studies, he travelled through Switzerland, France, England, and Germany, for the purpose of collating, with his own hand, all the manuscripts he could discover of the Greek Testament, and published, in 1730, his '*Prolegomena ad Novi Testamenti Græci editionem accuratissimam, e vetustissimis codicibus manuscriptis denuo procurandam ; in quibus agitur de codicibus manuscriptis Novi Testamenti, scriptoribus Græcis, qui Novo Testamento uti sunt, versionibus veteribus, editionibus prioribus, et claris interpretibus ; et proponuntur animadversiones et cautiones ad examen variarum lectionum Novi Testamenti necessariae.*' It appears from this title-page, that it was his original intention

\* Le Long, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, ed. Masch.

to form the text of his Greek Testament upon the best manuscript authority; but Michaelis says, that ‘as he was suspected of entertaining Socinian principles, and the world might have supposed, that his chief object was to propagate his own religious opinions, it was requested, if I mistake not, by the Arminians themselves, that he would make no alterations whatsoever.’\* His Greek Testament accordingly came out under the title, ‘*Novum Testamentum Græcum Editionis Receptæ.*’

The critical apparatus, furnished by Wetstein, is far more extensive and valuable, than that of all preceding editions united. He was not obliged to depend, like his predecessors, for the collation of his documents, except in a few instances, upon the accuracy of others; and consequently was enabled, by having personal access to the sources, whence others had drawn, to revise, and greatly augment, their materials, to correct their errors, and supply their defects. This is particularly observable, by a comparison of his collection of various readings with that of Mill; from which it appears, that the readings of a few manuscripts, which he had not the means of examining himself, he has copied from Mill; but, for the readings of the other manuscripts, and the printed editions, he applied directly to the original source; the readings of the Oriental Versions, for which Mill was obliged to depend upon the Latin translations in the London Polyglot, Wetstein has taken immediately from the Versions themselves; and has corrected those numerous mistakes, committed by Mill in making extracts from the writings of the Fathers, which almost necessarily attended the first attempt to apply them to the purposes of sacred criticism. In fine, he opened sources, which had remained till then unexplored; and ‘gave,’ says Bishop Marsh, ‘a new turn to the criticism of the Greek Testament, and laid the foundation, on which later editors have built.’

By some it has been suspected, that Wetstein allowed his judgment with regard to his various readings, to be influenced by his theological opinions. But Michaelis, though by no means a friend, pronounces, after a particular examination, that there is no ground for the suspicion. But while he testifies to the strict honesty and impartiality of Wetstein, in the character of a critic, it is otherwise in respect to his diligence and accuracy; for he has produced eighteen examples in proof of his confident assertion, that Wetstein was negligent and in-

\* Marsh's Michaelis, Vol. II. P. 1. p. 475.

accurate in the collation of his documents. But, suprising as it may seem, Bishop Marsh, having carefully examined the proofs, which Michaelis had adduced, positively contradicts the assertion, and declares, that, of the eighteen examples, upon which it is founded, 'thirteen are decidedly false, and the fourteenth doubtful.\*' We must therefore conclude, that it was prejudice against Wetstein, which induced Michaelis to make so confident a charge where he was possessed of but insufficient means of information.

In a work of such vast extent, where, it is said, above a *million* of quotations are imbodyed, which required the most minute and painful attention, mistakes must have been unavoidable, except to an infallible editor. Wetstein seems, it must be acknowledged, to have been sometimes precipitate in his judgments; and was probably hereby led into an error, in omitting altogether the various readings of the twenty two manuscripts collated by Caryophilus at Rome; whether, on account of a suspicion, that they were unworthy of notice as Latinizing manuscripts, or that the whole collection was an imposture.

The principal faults in Wetstein's Greek Testament seem to have arisen from his hostility to the Vulgate; which led him to depreciate every manuscript where he perceived a coincidence, and to condemn its readings as corrupted. Probably from this cause some of his best and most valuable manuscripts suffered materially in his estimation.

The account we have given of Wetstein's Greek Testament relates of course solely to its critical merits, and the means it affords for the emendation of the sacred text. Of its value to the interpreter it would be foreign to our purpose to speak.

We will now, in the last place, proceed to the account of the labors of Griesbach; the materials he used, and the rules he applied, for the formation of an *amended text*. Manuscript criticism had been the study of his life. He travelled, like Wetstein, particularly to examine himself the most ancient manuscripts wherever deposited in the public libraries abroad; and, regarding the great mass of various readings as entirely unimportant, otherwise than as they led to a judgment respecting the character of the manuscripts, in which they were found, made it his object to *revise* rather than *augment* the critical apparatus, furnished by the works of Mill, Bengel, and Wetstein. In re-collating the original documents, from which

\* See Marsh's Michaelis, vol. ii. P. II. pp. 558—573

they had drawn their materials, he has given to the public an honourable testimony in favor of their accuracy and fidelity. ‘Very seldom,’ says he, ‘have the authors of those collections of various readings so erred, as to assign to the manuscripts, versions, or fathers, readings different from those which really exist. I can speak with the greater confidence upon this subject, since, having examined many manuscripts anew, which were formerly collated by Mill and Wetstein, I have discovered indeed many omissions, but few erroneous quotations.’\*

As it was Griesbach’s intention to publish a Greek Testament, the text of which, though formed upon the basis of that of the Elzevir edition, should be corrected as required by the best and most ancient manuscript authority; he deemed it necessary to make only a *selection* of the most important and characteristic of the various readings; omitting all such as were mere errata, or corrections, or supported only by the trifling testimony of some modern document.

It will be unimportant to notice his first edition. printed at Halle, in 1775—1777, as all the materials it contained, together with additional extracts from two hundred new manuscripts were transferred to the second, published in two volumes 8vo. the one in 1796, and the other in 1806.

These additional manuscripts had been collated, with great labor and diligence, since the publication of his first edition, by Matthæi, Alter, Birch, Moldenhawer, and others; and many of them discovered to be of considerable antiquity, and of influence in deciding between the comparative claims of various readings. Of these, above fifty were carefully collated by Matthæi, professor at Moscow, who published their various readings in an edition of the Greek Testament, printed at Riga, in 1782—1788; the text of which was formed entirely upon their authority. The best catalogue of them is given by Griesbach, in his Prolegomena. They were all Moscow manuscripts, several of them in the *uncial* character, and supposed by Griesbach to have been written before the eighth century.

About the same time, Professor Alter of Vienna, published an edition, the text of which was formed solely upon the authority of one modern manuscript in the Imperial Library, the Codex Lambecii 1, and which, by way of eminence, he calls, in the title, *Codex Vindobonensis*. At the end is printed separately a collection of various readings, taken with great

\* Prolegomena, p. 48.

care from about twenty manuscripts, most of which had been before either entirely overlooked, or but superficially examined. To these are subjoined readings from the Coptic and Slavonian versions.

Professor Birch, of Copenhagen, published, in 1788, the result of his labors, together with that of those of Professor Adler and Moldenhawer; after having travelled through Germany, Italy, France and Spain, for the purpose of examining materials which had till then been neglected. About one hundred Greek manuscripts were collated, some wholly and carefully, others but partially and superficially, by Birch himself, in the libraries of Venice, Florence, and Rome; twelve Codices Escorialenses were collated by Moldenhawer, in Spain; extracts were made by Adler from the Syriac versions; particularly from one of great critical value, written in a peculiar dialect, and called by him the Syra Hierosolymitana; and, lastly, a complete and accurate collation was made of that most ancient and valuable manuscript, distinguished above all others as *the Codex Vaticanus*, of which it was impossible before to estimate the importance.

All these valuable critical materials, furnished by the works of Matthæi, Alter, and Birch, were transferred, we have said, by Griesbach, into his second edition. But, in addition to these, he was possessed of authorities, superior to those of any former editor. He had access to the copy of Mill's Greek Testament, which is preserved in the Bodleian library, at Oxford, containing numerous marginal readings in manuscript, which are said to have been written by Mill's own hand, from a large number of manuscripts, fathers, and versions, and which were unknown both to Küster, and to Wetstein,\* who used only Küster's edition. 'These marginal readings,' says Griesbach, in the preface to the first volume of his *Symbolæ Criticæ*, 'were faithfully extracted from manuscripts, and compose no contemptible supplement to the collections of various readings.' Perfect *fac similes* of two manuscripts of the highest antiquity, the Alexandrinus and Cantabrigiensis, published by Woide and Kipling, enabled Griesbach to revise with accuracy Wetstein's quotations, and easily correct his errors.

\* The error of Bishop Marsh, in supposing this copy of Mill to have been used by Wetstein, contained in his translation of Michaelis' Introduction, ed. 2d. vol. ii. P. II. p. 871, note 64, may be corrected by comparing note \*, page 51. Griesbach's Proleg. ed. 2d. with the preface and page 245, vol. i. *Symbolæ Criticæ*.

In his opinion of the character of these two manuscripts, and, in general of the *Codices Græco-Latini*, Griesbach differed essentially from Wetstein; who, supposing them all to contain texts, which had been corrupted throughout from the Latin versions, was willing to allow to their testimony, in favor of the claims of particular readings, but a slight degree of authority. But Griesbach, who was better qualified, by farther and more minute examination, as well as by natural temperament, to form a cool and impartial judgment, while he does not deny that the charge may be grounded with respect to some modern manuscripts, is confident in the conclusion, that the coincidence between these ancient manuscripts and the Latin versions, which has extended the suspicion of corruption even to the *Codex Alexandrinus*, may be most easily and satisfactorily accounted for, by the supposition, that they were all derived from common sources, or from very ancient copies, which were allied to each other by their characteristic readings. This conclusion is confirmed by the discovery, that not only the most ancient versions, as the Syriac and Coptic, which were made immediately from the original Greek, but also the quotations of Origen, frequently contain those very readings, upon which the accusation was grounded against the *Codices Græco-Latini*.\* Griesbach has consequently admitted the testimony of a large number of manuscripts, whose value Wetstein depreciated by an unfounded suspicion; and among these, are many of the most venerable antiquity, the influence of whose authority must essentially affect the decision, that is formed respecting the genuineness of the various readings.

The whole number of Greek manuscripts which were used by Griesbach, for the correction of his text, amounted to three hundred and fifty-five on the Gospels, one hundred and thirty on the Acts and Catholic Epistles, one hundred and sixty on the Epistles of Paul, and fifty-seven on the Apocalypse. Of these he has given a complete catalogue in his *Prolegomena*, with an account of the age and character of each, its state of preservation, and the portion of the New Testament it contains. Some of the most ancient have been repeatedly examined. Of what Griesbach has added by his own labors to the

\* The justice of this charge of Wetstein against the *Codices Græco-Latini* was first called in question by Semler, at a time when perhaps it was universally admitted by critics, in the 3d. vol. of his '*Hermeneutische Vorbereitung*,' printed in 1765. He has been followed by Griesbach, in his *Symbolæ Criticæ*, and by Woide and Kipling, in their prefaces to the fac-similes of the *Codices Alexandrinus* and *Cantabrigiensis*.



critical apparatus, and the important discoveries he has made, with regard to the character of some of the most valuable manuscripts, a full account is given in his *Symbolæ Criticæ*. In the second volume is contained a complete and accurate collation of the quotations from the New-Testament, which are found in the writings of Origen and Clement of Alexandria. These quotations in the works of the fathers are so numerous, that, had all other documents been lost, nearly the whole text of the New Testament might have been restored from the quotations of Origen alone.

Bode's *Pseudo-critica Millio-Bengeliana*, rendered Griesbach very important service, in enabling him to correct the errors, which had been committed by Mill, Bengel, and Wetstein, in their quotations from the Oriental versions. He acknowledges himself to have been under great obligations to Bredenkamp of Bremen, and Dabrowsky of Prague, for their collations of the Armenian and Slavonian versions; to Woide, Georgi, and Münster, for the readings of the Sahidic; to White, for the publication of the Philoxenian version, at Oxford; and, lastly, to Sabatier and Blanchini, for their publications of the old Latin versions, the collation of which has supplied him with many valuable readings.

Such are the materials which Griesbach applied to the restoration of the text of the New Testament to its original integrity. They comprise every thing valuable, that had been furnished by the labors of biblical critics for nearly three centuries, besides the vast and important accessions, which were made by himself. But notwithstanding all that had been done to open the sources of sacred criticism, and provide the means for the correction of the text, something more was wanting, than mere *number* of witnesses, to guide the critic in his estimation of the weight of authority, by which different readings were supported. The materials, which were collected, were abundantly sufficient to warrant a decision, but arrangement was wanting, and something to separate what was valuable from the great mass, in which it was lost. The mind became fatigued, in examining particularly, one by one, a hundred different and contradictory witnesses, and was confused in the attempt to balance the amount. When even the witnesses were but few in support of a particular reading, still no confidence could be placed in the accuracy of the judgment, which they might seem to require, as a farther collation of documents might change the weight of authority. Hence appears the

cause of the great want of uniformity in estimating the claims of various readings, which Griesbach has observed in Mill, Bengel, and Wetstein. Indeed, as all the manuscripts, that could ever be found, must bear but a small proportion to the immense numbers, which were written, certainty could never have been attained, nor uniformity of opinion produced.

But against all these evils, provision was made by the *systematical classification* adopted by Griesbach. He perceived the want of a *system*, to be applied to the purposes of sacred criticism, which might not only be easily adapted to use, but, being built upon a sure foundation, should preserve the text from the dangers of perpetual fluctuation, should force our assent, and leave nothing to a partial decision.

From the express testimony of the ancient fathers, as well as from their quotations compared with the readings of manuscripts and versions, he says, he discovered, that, as early as the third century, there was a remarkable difference *throughout* between the manuscript copies of the New Testament; that even then there existed several *recensions* or editions of the sacred text, which were distinguished from each other by numerous important and characteristic readings; and that, in process of time, as their distinctive features disappeared, others succeeded to their place, far less different from those which characterize the manuscripts of a modern date.\*

This discovery accordingly suggested to him the necessity or dividing all the authorities he possessed—manuscripts, versions, and fathers, into distinct and separate classes, which should correspond, as nearly as possible, to the several recen-

\* Vid. Curæ in Hist. textus Græci, Epist. Paul. sect. i. § 1.

The origin of the different recensions Griesbach explains, by supposing two manuscripts as nearly alike as possible, to be represented by the letters *A* and *B*. From *B* suppose copies were taken, denoted by *c, d, e, f,* &c. as far as *z*. If the transcriber of *c* committed ten mistakes, which would be a very moderate supposition indeed, these would not only be repeated in *d*, but increased by the addition of ten more. Mistakes would thus continue to accumulate, till in *z*, the text would be very different from that exhibited in *A*; and even more so, from that of the copies taken from *A*. When the text of *z* became multiplied in the copies, *α, β, γ,* etc., if those intervening between *B* and *z* had been destroyed or lost, *α, β, γ,* &c. though differing perhaps but little from the copies immediately preceding, viz. *x, y, z*, would be found to contain a text, differing *throughout*, and in many important readings, from *A*; and therefore would be said, with propriety, to belong to a different *recension* or edition. Other recensions would be likely to be formed in a similar manner; and each would be distinguished by characteristic differences, arising from the different countries in which they were formed. Thus the origin of the several recensions of the sacred text may be accounted for, by the supposition only of what, in the natural course of things, would most probably occur. Ibid. sect. i. § 17.

sions of the ancient text. These witnesses then he considered as bearing *direct* testimony only to the readings of the *recensions* to which they respectively belonged. The claims of the various readings to be regarded as genuine, he decided solely, by the weight of authority which was due to the recensions themselves. And this authority depended upon their antiquity, and their general character for purity and integrity. However great then was the number of witnesses of the same class, which were adduced in support of a particular reading, they were entitled to but *one voice*. Manuscripts, to the number of not less than thirty, quoted by Weststein, as independent authorities, upon the Epistles of Paul, being found by Griesbach to belong to the same class, were reduced to a single testimony.\* And, lastly, as the manuscripts which remain of the most ancient and pure recensions, are but few, in comparison with the large numbers which belong to the more modern, corrupt, and interpolated; the weight of one witness was sometimes sufficient to counterbalance a hundred.

These, in brief, are the *outlines* of that critical system, which was adopted by Griesbach, in preparing the text of his edition of the Greek Testament, and which furnishes the rules by which the critic must be guided in estimating the weight of *external* evidence. The rules of *internal* evidence are drawn from a knowledge of the *causes* which operated to produce the various readings. From his intimate acquaintance with manuscripts, he discovered that transcribers had been more prone to add than to omit; that they had been disposed to explain obscure and difficult passages; that they disliked ellipses, hebraisms, solecisms, and harsh and unusual modes of expression. From a knowledge of these circumstances he deduced the rules, that *cæteris paribus*, the readings which are shorter, those, that are more difficult and obscure, the harsh, elliptic and hebraistic, are the preferable; with several other rules, for which reference must be had to the third section of his Prolegomena. Of all of them the sum is, that we must consider that reading as deserving the preference, which, being assumed as the genuine, will most satisfactorily explain the origin of the rest.

Such are the most important of the advantages, which have accrued to the cause of sacred criticism from the labors of Griesbach. That nothing remains to be done by the efforts of others, was not his opinion. The Syriac and Armenian

\* Ibid. sect. i. § 7.

versions would afford more aid to the critic, if their texts were corrected by the readings of the best manuscript copies. Fragments only have been published of the Sahidic and Syriac of Jerusalem. Many Greek manuscripts, of no little value, have been but partially and negligently collated ; and the Florence library alone is said to contain no less than a thousand, which have never been examined. But this is probably of far less importance than it might, at first view, appear. By means of the manuscripts which have been already collated, together with the versions and quotations of the fathers, the several classes of authorities have become so established, as to leave to the exertions of future critics but little prospect of a change.

From the survey we have now taken of the vast and valuable accessions, which have been made to the stock of critical materials, by the labors of Mill, Wetstein, and Griesbach ; the advantages possessed by the modern critic for the emendation of the sacred text, it is obvious, must surpass, in an almost inestimable degree, the humble pretensions of the editors of the *Received Text*.

They copied, as we have seen, almost solely from the third edition of Stephens ; a few variations of no authority being taken from Beza. Stephens closely followed the fifth edition of Erasmus ; a very few places only, together with Apocalypse, being excepted, where he preferred the Complutensian edition. And Erasmus, who alone appears to have had any pretensions as a critical editor, being destitute of all aids for determining the genuine reading, prepared his text, *as well as he could*, from a very few modern manuscripts, by means of inaccurate editions of a few of the fathers, an interpolated vulgate, and his own conjecture.

But the labors of Mill, Wetstein, and Griesbach, in the collation of hundreds of manuscripts that have since been discovered, some of which have claims to as high an antiquity as the fifth century ; together with the eastern versions, made in the earliest ages of christianity ; and the quotations from the New Testament in the writings of the fathers, have furnished a collection of various readings, amounting probably to more than *one hundred thousand*, by means of which an editor of the Greek Testament is enabled, at the present day, to give to the world a *text*, alike freed from the errors, which have arisen from the unavoidable mistakes of transcription, or intentional corruptions.